

**REMARKS**

This Reply and Amendment is intended to be completely responsive to the non-final Office Action dated March 22, 2005. Claims 1-25 are pending in this Application and stand rejected. Independent Claims 1, 9 and 15 have been amended.

**Claim Objections**

In the Detailed Action, the Examiner stated that independent Claim 9 is objected to because “an” should be “a” in line 3.

The Applicant has amended Claim 9 in a manner that has addressed the objection. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to independent Claim 9.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1**

In the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 9-14 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

**Claim 9**

Independent Claim 9 has been amended for clarity to recite a “method” comprising in combination the steps of “providing a base having an aperture and a platform portion; mounting the electronic device on the base by positioning a body portion of the electronic device within the aperture and overlaying the projection on the platform portion; coupling a cover member to the base so that the projection is captured between the platform portion and the cover member and the body portion is substantially free of contact with the base and the cover member; and coupling the base to the vehicle interior.

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 have been overcome and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 9-14. The Applicant also believes that Claims 9-14 recite combinations of subject matter that are not disclosed, taught or suggested in U.S. Patent No. 5,850,078 (Giordano et al.).

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2**

In the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 and 15-25 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

**Claims 1-8**

Independent Claim 1 has been amended for clarity to recite a “mounting device adapted for use in a vehicle interior.” The “electronic device” is positively recited in the claims and the “vehicle interior” is not positively recited in the claims.

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 have been overcome and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-8.

**Claims 15-25**

Independent Claim 15 has been amended for clarity to recite an “Apparatus.” An “electronic device” is positively recited in the claims and a “vehicle interior” is not positively recited in the claims.

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 have been overcome and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 15-25.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

In the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected independent Claims 1-8 and 15-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. (“Giordano et al.”).

Giordano et al. discloses a “chassis 50” with a “rectangular cutout 54” and a “generally planar circuit board 104 [that] is snap-mounted onto the chassis” (see col. 4, lines 9, 15 and 38-39).

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is in independent form. Independent Claim 1 (as amended) recites a “mounting structure for an electronic device” comprising, in combination with other elements, an “electronic device configured to fit within the aperture and having at least one projection extending between the base and the cover.” A “mounting structure for an electronic device” as required by Claim 1 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Giordano et al. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that independent Claim 1 (as amended) is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-8.

Independent Claim 15

Claim 15 is in independent form. Independent Claim 15 (as amended) recites an “apparatus” comprising, in combination with other elements, an “electronic device having a body portion positioned within the aperture.” An “apparatus” as required by Claim 15 (as amended) is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Giordano et al. Accordingly, the Applicant submits independent Claim 15 (as amended) is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 15-25.

The Applicant respectfully submits that each and every outstanding objection and rejection to the pending claims has been overcome, and the Application is in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 7, 9-10, 14-16, 21 and 24 have been amended. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of pending Claims 1-25.


\* \* \*

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this Application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, the Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date MAY 19, 2005

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 26371

Telephone: (414) 297-5591

Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

John M. Lazarus

Attorney for the Applicant

Registration No. 48,367